



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/766,271	01/18/2001	Stefaan Valere Albert Coussement	P4645	1707

24739 7590 05/07/2004

CENTRAL COAST PATENT AGENCY
PO BOX 187
AROMAS, CA 95004

EXAMINER

DENNISON, JERRY B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/766,271

Applicant(s)ALBERT COUSSEMENT,
STEFAN VALERE**Examiner**

J. Bret Dennison

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in response to Application Number 09/766271 received on 18 January 2001.
2. Claims 1-32 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,345,305), hereinafter referred to by Beck, in view of Pepe et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,742,905) hereinafter referred to by Pepe.

3. Regarding claim 1, Beck discloses an application for enabling a client to interact with communication-center resources comprising:

a customer interaction server coupled to the communication center (Beck, col. 6, lines 57-59);

a network-capable appliance coupled to the interaction server (Beck, col. 6, lines 57-59);

Art Unit: 2143

at least one agent workstation in the communication center (Beck, col. 6, lines 20-25);

an interactive client interface component operable by the client for posting client data and for receiving and displaying agent and interaction data from the communication center (Beck, col. 7, lines 20-26, Beck teaches a CINOS-agent desktop interface for clients to interact with the parent application);

a brokering component for managing client and communication center data and communication (Beck, col. 6, lines 57-65, Beck teaches a system for managing communications center and client interactions); and

a status monitoring and reporting component for monitoring, and reporting communication center and client status (Beck, col. 7, lines 13-17, Beck teaches a customer information-system to store and serve information relative to customers including status);

Beck does not disclose the application being characterized in that a client using the user interface is enabled to access and alter communication center data, and also to initiate live interaction with the communication center.

In an analogous art to networking, Pepe discloses a system for personal communications internetworking wherein the user can modify his/her subscriber profile (Pepe, col. 6, lines 34-45)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Beck with Pepe to provide a system allowing its users to control and integrate a plurality of messaging options by allowing users to access and

edit user data located at the communication center (Pepe, col. 3, lines 18-43).

4. Regarding claims 2 and 18, Beck and Pepe teach the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 1 and 17, including wherein the components are distributed among computerized stations interconnected in a communication network (Beck, col. 6, lines 19-25).

5. Regarding claims 3 and 19, Beck and Pepe teach the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 2 and 18, including wherein the communications network includes one or more of a data packet network (DPN) and a connection-oriented switched-telephony (COST) network (Beck, col. 5, lines 45-52, Beck teaches using COST calls, and data is transmitted as addressed packets).

6. Regarding claims 4 and 20, Beck and Pepe teach the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 3 and 19, including wherein the communications network further includes at least one local area network (LAN) (Beck, col. 6, lines 35-40).

7. Regarding claims 5 and 21, Beck and Pepe teach the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 3 and 19, including wherein the (DPN) is the Internet network (Beck, col. 5, lines 40-43).

8. Regarding claims 6 and 22, Beck and Pepe teach the limitations, substantially as

claimed, as described in claims 1 and 17, including wherein communication and transfer of status information is accomplished using a presence protocol (Beck, col. 5, lines 44-62).

9. Regarding claims 7 and 23, Beck and Pepe teach the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 6 and 22, including wherein the preference presence protocol used is compatible with the IMPP-IETF RFC 2778 protocol (Beck, col. 5, lines 44-62, Beck teaches using the Internet Protocol (IP)).

10. Regarding claims 8 and 24, Beck and Pepe teach the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 1 and 17, including wherein the client data includes one or more of personal demographic data communication capability data, personal agenda data, and personal interest data (Pepe, col. 6, lines 34-45).

11. Regarding claims 9 and 25, Beck and Pepe teach the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 1 and 17, including wherein the communication-center data includes one or more of interaction history records, product information, order-status information, and agent-availability information (Beck, col. 4, lines 2-35, col. 7, lines 15-16, Beck teaches storing transaction information as history records).

12. Regarding claims 10 and 26, Beck and Pepe teach the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 1 and 17, including wherein the communication

center status includes one or more of number of available agents, number of calls holding, estimated hold time, and communication capability data (Beck, col. 7, lines 12-17).

13. Regarding claims 11 and 27, Beck and Pepe teach the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 9 and 25, including wherein the interaction history records are categorized by product (Beck, col. 7, lines 12-17, Beck teaches clients being able to obtain information on product preferences, meaning that the information is categorized by product).

14. Regarding claims 12 and 28, Beck and Pepe teach the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 11 and 27, including wherein the interaction history records are further categorized by participating agent (Beck, col. 7, lines 13-15, Beck teaches the information system server adapted to store and serve information relevant to customers participating, therefore the history records are categorized by participating agents).

15. Regarding claims 13 and 29, Beck and Pepe teach the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 9 and 25. Beck also teaches keeping a chronological history of all transactions including text-based events (Beck, col. 8, lines 19-25) but does not explicitly state wherein the interaction history records are date and time stamped. However, keeping a chronological history requires using a date/time

stamp to keep order of events. Therefore it would have been obvious to one in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a time/date stamp for all interaction history records to maintain a chronological order of transaction events.

16. Regarding claims 14 and 30, Beck and Pepe teach the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 1 and 17, including wherein the communication managed by the brokering application comprises status alerts related to client and/or agent states (Beck, col. 7, lines 13-15, beck teaches the information system server adapted to store and serve information relevant to customers participating, therefore the history records are categorized by participating agents).

17. Regarding claims 15, 16, 31, and 32, Beck and Pepe teach the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 14 and 30, including wherein the communication managed by the brokering application further comprises invitation messages sent by either agents or clients for initiating communication (Beck, col. 6, line 57 through col. 7, line 8, Beck teaches that CINOS is adapted to support email applications, therefore a client can send an invitation message in the form of an email to initiate communication).

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2143

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Bret Dennison whose telephone number is (703)305-8756. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on (703)308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

J. Bret Dennison
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2143


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100